


Remark:

In response to the office action of application 09/419,752 dated 06/05/02 and the subsequent telephone interview dated 09/03/02, it was found that page 30 of the specification, which documented claims 26 to 31 and the supporting drawings are missing. Accordingly a new clean copy of the subject application together with the original claims and original drawings are resubmitted for the evaluation of the examiner. The clean copy also reflects amendment of the specification entered as above. It was found that the description of specification about Figure 8 as shown in the Table of Content is also missing. Accordingly a very brief description of Figure 8 (identical to Figure 8 of the parent application) is included in the amendment. Since the concept of the prefix had already been described in Figure 6B, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The applicant wishes to express his sincere thanks to the courtesy of the examiner in the telephone conference dated 09/03/02. During the interview, it was agreed that each of the independent claims will be individually reconsidered against the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection. The examiner is also respectfully requested to review the remark dated October 16, 1999 submitted together with the subject application and provide responses according to this remark submitted. A copy of the remark dated October 16, 1999 is attached in this response for the convenience of the examiner. It was further agreed that another telephone conference will be scheduled prior to the issue of the next office action, and that the next office will not be set final.

Since patentable and practical applications in the technology art are identified and agreed, the modification of the claims to overcome the 35 USC §101 rejection is a matter of formality. The Applicant hereby respectfully requests the Examiner to propose broadest allowable claim or specification amendment to the application pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) if further amendment to any claim is required for the rejection to be overcome.

Respectfully submitted by,


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peter Lam', written over a horizontal line.

Peter Lam

Applicant
20104 Wayne Ave.,
Torrance, CA 90503.

Telephone: (310) 320-9811
Fax: (310) 320-9812

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on September 4, 2002.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peter Ar-Fu Lam', written over a horizontal line.

Peter Ar-Fu Lam